

Texas Project Delivery Framework

Master Change Request List

As of 1/26/2011

| Change Request ID | Long Description | Impacted Framework Version | Originator Agency | Originator Name | Impact Area | Impact Level | CAB Review Date | CAB Impact | CAB Priority | CAB Action | CAB Action Date | DIR Approval Date | DIR Action | DIR Action Date | Implemented Framework Version |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 63 | The Framework should be amended to include a more detailed description of how continuous improvement (CPI) is achieved within the project lifecycle. CPI can be achieved via the adoption and/or the continued improvement of SDLC best practices within a project. Project managers should insure that their projects include objectives which foster the usage of SDLC best practices whenever possible. Executive management should take steps to encourage that any improvement in best practice usage is communicated and adopted across their organization. In addition, any successes/failures with the usage of the SDLC best practices should be shared, not just within a specific project, but across all similar projects. Sharing of this critical information will allow for the synergistic improvement of best practices across all state agencies. The attached document provides a solution as to how CPE could be achieved. | 2.5 | Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts | Richard Dachowski | Project Closeout, Project Plan, Monitoring Report, Statewide Impact Analysis, Review Gate Approval, Framework Guidance, Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes | Major | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | Project Plan submission files submitted to state-level entities often do not meet requirements specified in the Framework guidance. The desired outcome is to clarify Framework guidance and tool instructions to enhance the ability of agencies to meet requirements specified in the guidance, related to Project Plan submission files. | 2.3 | Department of Information Resources | Roslyn Hotard | Framework Guidance, Project Plan | Moderate | 7/20/2010 | | | | | | | | 2.4 |
| 61 | This change request is related to and enhances Change Request 54. Two Business Challenges. #1- Information provided by the Business Case Workbook may be an inaccurate representation of the project due to fields being misaligned, mistabeled, miscalculated or misleading. #2 - Agency staff using the Business Case Workbook to produce post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes as directed in the PIRBO instructions find many fields are not represented in both documents or they do not align. See attachment. | 2.3 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Teri Augustine | Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes, Framework Other - Web, Guidance, Business Case | Major | 7/20/2010 | Major | High | Recommend with modifications | | | | | |
| 60 | The business problem is the Business Case Model and the Workbook Model provided on the DIR website uses an out of date version of the Workbook template. Consequently many of the examples do not align with currently published instructions and workbook template. The desired outcome is to have the Model Workbook updated to the latest version, and for this update to become part of the Framework update process so this Model Workbook is updated each time the Framework is updated. An attachment is included with this change request showing suggestions for alignment with the instructions. | 2.2 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Teri Augustine | Framework Other - All, Business Case | Major | 2/3/2010 | None | | Withdrew On | 2/3/2010 | 2/3/2010 | Withdrew On | 2/3/2010 | |
| 59 | The business problem is the Business Case Model and the Workbook Model provided on the DIR website were compared to the current Business Case Instructions and twenty one items were found where the documentation does not align with the instructions. This is a problem because users will use this model and assume due to its location that it is usable example without significant error. (This is a different issue than the Model using an outdated version of the template addressed in a previous change request. The desired outcome is to have the Model Workbook updated and any issues corrected. An attachment is included with this change request showing suggestions for alignment with the instructions. | 2.2 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Teri Augustine | Framework Other - All, Business Case | Major | 2/3/2010 | None | | Withdrew On | 2/3/2010 | 2/3/2010 | Withdrew On | 2/3/2010 | |
| 58 | The Business Case Workbook (BCW) has Evaluation Factors, which some of them may be non-monetary. Despite best efforts to develop quantitative measures of some project benefits, there are situations that simply do not lend themselves to quantify in dollars. Such as benefits as transparency value, improved overall public perception of government, improved quality of the environment, safety and security. Although the Business Case implies that in some cases the qualitative factors can provide the foundation for justifying the project, there is not clarification on how QAT includes the non-monetary factors into the project approval process. We propose to add additional evaluation factors to cover benefits such as transparency and improved public perception of government, and safety. We also recommend QAT provide greater information about the QAT project approval decision related to the weight of the non-monetary factors. | 2.3 | Department of Motor Vehicles | Theol Jackman | Business Case | Moderate | 7/20/2010 | | | Reject | | | | | |
| 57 | The current Business Case Workbook (BCW) does not provide the total project cost separately from the total project life cycle cost. Because the QAT Monitoring report the BCW estimated project cost must be reported. We propose to split the Cost Analysis worksheet in two different worksheets: implementation and post implementation costs. Also, the Other Costs section should split the implementation and post implementation operations costs on each respective worksheet. The current Cost-Benefit summary worksheet would summarize the previous two cost worksheets to calculate the project and product life cycle costs. Also, because the BCW is used as the basis for developing the ITD, greater information is needed about which BCW line categories, such as agency personnel, agency personnel fringe benefits, and contingency, must be included on the ITD report. To facilitate the comparison of these reports, we propose to move the BCW category lines that are non-common on both reports to the end of the BCW. | 2.3 | Department of Motor Vehicles | Theol Jackman | Business Case | Major | 7/20/2010 | Major | High | Recommend with modifications | | | | | |
| 56 | The business problem is that the Acquisition Plan webpage, instructions, and template do not clearly and consistently state which types of acquisitions require use of the Plan. The desired outcome is that confusion over applicability of the Acquisition Plan is reduced. | 2.2 | Health and Human Services Commission | Sara Hill | Acquisition Plan, Framework Other - Web | Moderate | 2/3/2010 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 5/31/2010 | Approve | | 2.4, 2.5 |
| 55 | The business problem is the lack of a unique identifying key for project tracking. The ITD number changes each biennium. Project documentation displays old ITD numbers on documents or the old ITD number is not displayed for tracking purposes. Desired outcome is to have modified Framework templates (Business Case and SIA) to include fields for historical ITD numbers. An alternative outcome would be modified instructions explaining the ITD number changes and describing a solution. | 2.2 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Teri Augustine | Business Case, Statewide Impact Analysis | Major | 7/20/2010 | Minor | Low | Recommend with modifications | | 11/23/2010 | Approve | | 2.5 |

Texas Project Delivery Framework Master Change Request List

As of 1/26/2011

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| 54 | Project managers currently have to keep separate project records because they must maintain project cost information that is not calculated in the Business Case Workbook (Workbook). If the Workbook calculated the cost of a project from initiation through implementation separate from the cost of product maintenance and operations, it would ensure accurate communication with federal partners who help fund agency projects. Currently, both these figures are summed for ten years and misleadingly labeled Total Project Costs. In addition, as distinct project cost is not calculated in the Workbook, project managers must maintain separate financial records and then they only use the Workbook for reporting purposes. This creates redundant work and means the Workbook financial records are often obsolete. | 2.2 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Teri Augustine | Business Case | Moderate | 7/20/2010 | Major | High | Recommend with modifications | | | | | |
| 53 | The business problem is the Framework includes dynamic information (e.g., contact names, submission timeline dates) that is managed under configuration control and when changed, forces development of unnecessary change requests and potentially new releases. The desired outcome is to provide the ability to implement such changes without triggering use of formal release and configuration management processes. Instead, the dynamic information will be communicated in a manner that does not involve configuration control. | 2.2 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Framework Other - Web, Framework Guidance | Moderate | | | | | 11/6/2009 | Approve | | | 2.3 |
| 52 | The business problem is the inability to quickly identify specific tools within the Framework toolset, especially for an individual (e.g., program staff) that is not as familiar with the general order of use or review gates. The desired outcome is to provide the ability to quickly scan and access a list of available tools. | 2.2 | Texas Department of State Health Services | William Hanna | Framework Other - Web, Framework Guidance | Minor | 7/14/2009 | | | Defer Until | 1/29/2010 | | Withdraw On | 1/20/2010 | |
| 51 | The business problem is the Contract Advisory Team (CAT) contact designated by the Comptroller of Public Accounts (CPA) changed. Mark KasPar replaced Woody Fluharty. The desired outcome is to ensure Framework guidance and tools reflect the most accurate and up-to-date information possible. | 2.1 | Comptroller of Public Accounts | Mark KasPar | Framework Other - Web, Framework Guidance | Minor | | | | | 6/24/2009 | Approve | | | 2.2 |
| 50 | No business problem exists. The desired outcome is to revise Framework guidance to reflect legislative changes adopted in the 81st Legislature Regular Session (2009). The following legislative changes must be incorporated based on an effective date of September 1, 2009: a) modification to the project definition (House Bill 1705), b) modification to the project management practices definition (House Bill 1705). | 2.1 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Framework Other - Web, Framework Guidance | Minor | | | | | 6/22/2009 | Approve | | | 2.2 |
| 49 | The business problem is Framework guidance for when submission of the Monitoring Report ends is unclear, and is also inconsistent with the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) guidance. The Monitoring Report Instructions state a Monitoring Report is no longer required or requested by the QAT once the project is closed; however, the specific conditions for when to stop using the Monitoring Report are not addressed. In addition, the QAT Policy and Procedures Manual does not specifically state when submission of the Monitoring Report ends. The desired outcome is to make the Framework guidance clear and also consistent with the QAT guidance. | 2.1 | Department of State Health Services | Suzanne Carter | Monitoring Report | Minor | | | | | 5/11/2009 | Approve | | | 2.2 |
| 48 | Do not require Agency Head approval signature on the Review Gate Approval documents. Let each agency decide who should sign this document and be more in alignment with each agency's IT project governance standards. This would better match other signature requirements for documents that do not go outside the agency such as the Project Charter, Acceptance to Deploy, and Project Closeout Report. | 2.1 | Texas Department of Transportation | Karen VanHooser | Review Gate Approval | | 2/11/2009 | Moderate | Medium | Recommend with modifications | | 3/3/2009 | Approve | | 2.2 |
| 47 | The business problem is the inability to copy the financial information from the Business Case Workbook into the Business Case Word document because the Workbook is password protected. All of the values must be re-keyed. The instructions require copying specific information from the Business Case Workbook into the Business Case. The protection on the Workbook does not allow for selection of the information to be copied and therefore, data must be re-keyed which is inefficient. The desired outcome is to provide the ability to copy the financial information. | 2.0 | Office of the Attorney General | Scott McKenzie | Business Case | Moderate | 2/11/2009 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 2/25/2009 | Approve | | 2.2 |
| 46 | Correct inconsistencies in use of the Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval deliverable in Framework and QAT guidance. QAT Policy and Procedures Manual states: Agencies use internal methods to obtain agency head approval of amendment or change orders that change the monetary value of the contract by more than 10% of initial contract amount or significantly changes contract completion date, including use of the Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval tool. Agencies notify QAT when a 10% or greater change occurs via letter and submission of the Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval. Neither the Quick Reference, or Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval Instructions, convey submission of a Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval deliverable to QAT. Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval Instructions do not convey QAT approval of a contract amendment based on information in a submitted Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval deliverable | 2.0 | Leg Budget Board for the Quality Assurance Team | Richard Corbell | Framework Other - Web, Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval, Framework Guidance | Minor | 7/24/2008 | Major | High | Recommend | | 9/15/2008 | Approve | | 2.1, 2.2 |
| 45 | The business problem is lack of clarity in a section of the Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes Instructions. Section 3.1.2 instructs to practitioners to describe and summarize what appears to be two separate topics. The desired outcome is to clarify the instructions and provide a consistent approach. | 2.0 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes | Minor | 7/24/2008 | Moderate | Medium | Recommend with modifications | | 9/15/2008 | Approve | | 2.1 |
| 44 | The business problem is the Framework guidance does not clearly convey information regarding applicability of the Framework to major information resources projects, regardless of the funding source. The desired outcome is to ensure Framework guidance provides clear information. | 1.9 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Framework Other - Web, Framework Guidance | Minor | | | | | 5/15/2008 | Approve | | | 2.0 |
| 43 | The business problem is an inaccurate statement made within the Solicitation and Contracting Review Gate web page located at: http://www.dir.state.tx.us/pubs/framework/gate3/index.htm which states that "A decision regarding procurement is made during the Project Planning Review Gate." Proposal - This statement should be removed. | 1.7 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Don McGrew | Framework Other - Web | Major | 7/24/2008 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 9/15/2008 | Approve | | 2.1 |
| 42 | The business problem is the instructions for section 1.1 of the Configuration Management Plan are unclear. The desired outcome is to clarify expected content of the section in order to provide guidance and examples to those who use the tool. The section is intended to request a graphical depiction of the how the project relates to the organizations that are responsible for configuration management for the project. | 1.8 | Department of Information Resources | Roslyn Hotard | Configuration Management Plan | Minor | 1/30/2008 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | | | | 2.0 |

Texas Project Delivery Framework Master Change Request List

As of 1/26/2011

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|--|--|-----------|---------|--|--------------------|
| 41 | The business problem is Framework guidance and tools convey information that has become outdated due to recent external changes (e.g., retirement of the Internal Quality Assurance Guidelines, changes to the Information Resource Strategic Plan). The desired outcome is to ensure Framework guidance and tools reflect the most accurate and up-to-date information possible. DIR will complete an analysis to incorporate specific revisions based on recent changes. | 1.8 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Risk Management Plan, Business Case, Framework Guidance | Moderate | | | | | | | 11/6/2007 | Approve | | 1.9, 2.1 |
| 40 | The business problem is sometimes agencies promote use of the Framework as filling in documents versus use of Framework tools to create project deliverables. These deliverables are used throughout the entire project life cycle, and not just for documenting project information as a one-time task. The desired outcome is to revise Framework guidance and tools as necessary to replace references to document with references to tool or deliverable. | 1.7 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Framework Guidance, Project Plan | Minor | | | | | | | 9/21/2007 | Approve | | 1.8, 2.0 |
| 39 | No business problem exists. The desired Outcome is to revise Framework guidance to Reflect the legislative change referenced in House Bill 3560 relating to transferring to the Comptroller of Public Accounts (CPA) the duties of TBPC that do not primarily concern state facilities. The agency name "TBPC" must be changed to "CPA." | 1.7 | Department of Information Resources | Roslyn Hotard | Communication Management Plan, Framework Guidance, Business Case, Project Charter, Acquisition Plan, Acceptance to Deploy, Framework Other - Web, Performance Management Plan, Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes, Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval, Project Plan, Review Gate Approval, Risk Management Plan, Statewide Impact Analysis, Configuration Management Plan, Project Closeout | Major | | | | | | | 9/14/2007 | Approve | | 1.8, 2.0 |
| 38 | The business goals for this change request are: 1. Easy for project manager to understand and navigate document and enter data. 2. Manageable to scale responses within sections. 3. Enable various options for sub-plans (e.g., communication, configuration). 4. Require few updates during project execution (i.e., low maintenance). 5. Support industry standards. 6. Follow uniform organization of information. 7. Eliminate redundancy. The revised template allows the user to reference a stand-alone document in some sections to allow more detail/emphasis on the information or to use an organization's standard template. See recommended changes tracked within the attached Project Plan. | 1.7 | TWC, HHSC, CPA | Leslie Howes, Don McGrew, Cindy Gray | Supplemental Tool - Project Plan, Framework Guidance, Project Plan, Communication Management Plan, Configuration Management Plan, Risk Management Plan, Framework Other - Web, Performance Management Plan | Major | 1/30/2008 | Major | High | Recommend | | | 3/20/2008 | Approve | | 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 |
| 37 | No business problem exists. The desired outcome is to revise Framework guidance to reflect legislative changes adopted in the 80th Legislature Regular Session (2007). The following legislative changes must be incorporated based on an effective date of September 1, 2007: a) Business Case and Statewide Impact Analysis submission to QAT instead of LBB, SAO, and DIR. b) Framework applicability to major contracts in addition to major information resources projects. c) Project Plan submission to QAT and DIR instead of to QAT and TBPC (House Bill 3560) | 1.6 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Business Case, Statewide Impact Analysis, Acquisition Plan, Framework Other - Web, Project Plan, Framework Guidance | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7, 2.0, 2.4 |
| 36 | The business problems are the repetitive nature of Business Case content that is already described in other Framework guidance and tools, and the lack of clarity in key components of business case analysis. The desired outcome is to streamline and clarify guidance for the Business Case when possible. DIR will complete an analysis to incorporate specific revisions based on feedback provided in focus groups, correspondence, briefings, and other forums. In addition, specific revisions will be associated with future training objectives. | 1.6 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Medium | Recommend | | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 35 | Combine the 4 sub-plans into the main project plan, combine redundant sections such as glossaries, and landscape selected tables in appendices to allow all information about a single item on one row. | 1.6 | Texas Workforce Commission | Leslie Howes | Configuration Management Plan, Framework Guidance, Project Plan, Framework Other - Web, Communication Management Plan, Risk Management Plan, Performance Management Plan | Major | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |

Texas Project Delivery Framework Master Change Request List

As of 1/26/2011

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|--|-----------|---------|--|-----|
| 34 | Beginning of each template: In item 4, provide direction about whether the abbreviated instructions are to be deleted. In item 5, it says to update page numbers only; however, the desired method still leaves incorrect page numbers | 1.6 | Texas Workforce Commission | Leslie Howes | Supplemental Tool - Risk Management Plan, Framework Guidance, Acquisition Plan, Review Gate Approval, Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval, Business Case, Acceptance to Deploy, Statewide Impact Analysis, Project Closeout, Project Charter, Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes, Project Plan, Communication Management Plan, Framework Other - Web, Monitoring Report, Supplemental Tool - Project Plan, Risk Management Plan, Configuration Management Plan, Performance Management Plan, Framework Extension - SDLC | Minor | 7/11/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 33 | Recommend making references to law and policy that supports the Framework a hyperlink for easy reference. | 1.6 | Texas Workforce Commission | Leslie Howes | Framework Other - Web, Framework Guidance | Minor | 7/11/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 32 | Business Case Workbook, Cost Analysis and Cost-Benefit Summary sheets 1. Separate one-time from recurring costs in the detail and the summary. 2. Provide an additional column for the one-time costs to include the corresponding amount for each item that is included in the project's Information Technology Detail (ITD) for the LAR and BOP. | 1.6 | Texas Workforce Commission | Leslie Howes | Business Case, Framework Guidance | Major | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 31 | Risk Management Checklist asks if funding is set aside, suggesting its part of Management Reserve. Costs allocated to risk management are contingency reserves and part of the budget. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Supplemental Tool - Risk Management Plan | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 30 | Supplemental Documents - consider adding a sign-off page to the supplemental documents. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Supplemental Tool - Risk Management Plan, Supplemental Tool - Project Plan | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 29 | 1.3 Performance Objectives - Recommend swapping the order of 1.3 Performance Objectives with 1.2 Roles Definition. Completing the roles definition needs the performance objectives identified first for inclusion into the matrix. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Performance Management Plan | Minor | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 28 | 3.2.1 Risk Items and 3.2.2 Risk Status - An explanation of the available tools should be in a separate paragraph. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Risk Management Plan | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 27 | 3.4 Work Activities - Recommend developing the WBS and WBS Dictionary in a separate document and referencing here. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Project Plan | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Minor | High | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 26 | 3.3 Estimation Methods and Estimates - Recommend changing the estimate recommendation to be closer to a generally accepted (PMI) definitive range. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Project Plan | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 25 | 2.2 External Interfaces. The table only provides columns for the organization name and the person. Provide a column for a description of the relationship or purpose of the organization. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Project Plan | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 24 | Recommend using a simple risk table with the possible headings of: Risk/Trigger/Mitigation while expanding the instructions. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Monitoring Report | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 23 | QAT - 2.1 Project Cost - Provide a space for Current Amount Encumbered. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Monitoring Report | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 22 | QAT Template - General Information - Consider adding a field for reporting frequency, e.g. quarterly, monthly, and add a field for the due date of the document. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Monitoring Report | Minor | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 21 | QAT Monitoring Report - The cover sheet has a place for signatures. Add key stakeholder titles to the signature block. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Monitoring Report | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 20 | Introduction - Recommend providing a section delineating project objectives. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Monitoring Report | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 19 | Business Case Worksheet - Overall (section) - Require explanations for evaluation factor extremes with the ratings of both 1 or 5. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Framework Other - Business Case Worksheet, Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 18 | 8.0 Revision History - Change the document title from "Name" to "Name of Preparer" or some other more descriptive heading. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Minor | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 17 | 6.1 Methodology - Add the concept of prioritization to the project selection. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 16 | 5.4 Financial Analysis - The instructions do not map directly to the template. Develop a one-to-one correlation from the instructions to the template. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Medium | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 15 | 5.1 Statutory Fulfillment - The table in the template does not suggest the level of detail shown in the instructions. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 14 | 5.0 Project Evaluation - Indicate in the business case template and instructions this data is associated with the business case detailed data found in the worksheet. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | High | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 13 | 4.3 Performance Metrics - Redesign the table in the template to help develop metrics while providing more instructions in the template. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 12 | 4.2 Goals and Objectives - Clarify instructions in the template - provide more detail while in the template while referring to the instruction section for good examples. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 11 | 3.3 Current Technology Environment - Add to the instructions - for example, when saying "provide brief description" define 'brief' and 'description' while providing examples for each of the areas in the template. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 10 | 2.2 Business Case Team Members. Create a more comprehensive table format which would drive completing the requisite information. | 1.6 | Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Medium | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |

Texas Project Delivery Framework Master Change Request List

As of 1/26/2011

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|--|-----------|---------|--|-----|
| 9 | The CAB Change Request Form - enable the spell checker allowing the development of correctly spelled documents | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Framework Other - CAB Change Request Form | Minor | 7/11/2007 | | | Reject | | 7/17/2007 | Reject | | NA |
| 8 | Business Case Template - Cost Analysis Tab (P14 Section) - Add Accessibility estimation cell (similar to Disaster Recovery). | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Business Case | Moderate | 7/11/2007 | Moderate | Medium | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.9 |
| 7 | Project Plan Template - 5.2 Quality Standards: Recommend expanding section to include additional PM best practice standards. | 1.6 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | John C. Smith | Acquisition Plan, Project Plan, Project Charter, Communication Management | Minor | 7/11/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 7/17/2007 | Approve | | 1.7 |
| 6 | Remove the words Framework Tool from the Framework Quick Reference heading. | 1.5 | Department of Information Resources | Roslyn Hotard | Framework Guidance | Minor | 4/9/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 4/9/2007 | Approve | | 1.6 |
| 5 | Having a version and revision date on the Monitoring Report serves no purpose. Reporting period should be used instead | 1.5 | Texas Workforce Commission | Jeanette Bradfield | Monitoring Report | Minor | 4/9/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 4/9/2007 | Approve | | 1.6 |
| 4 | Revise the Version History introductory text in all Framework Instruction tools. Remove reference to "including a glossary." Change the word "document" to "tool", where | 1.5 | Department of Information Resources | Rose Wheeler | Acquisition Plan, Review Gate Approval, Business Case, | Minor | 4/9/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 4/9/2007 | Approve | | 1.6 |
| 3 | Identify statutory references in the Submission Requirements Timeline Description for project approval and other similar activities | 1.5 | Texas Department of Transportation | Karen Van Hooser | Test Plan | Minor | 4/9/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 4/9/2007 | Approve | | 1.6 |
| 2 | Indicate in the Framework Quick Reference that the Acquisition Plan is referenced in statute as the Procurement Plan. | 1.5 | Texas Department of Transportation | Karen Van Hooser | Framework Guidance | Minor | 4/9/2007 | Minor | Low | Recommend | | 4/9/2007 | Approve | | 1.6 |
| 1 | Have a one click button to download all the Framework tools - handbook, instructions, templates, worksheets and examples. | 1.5 | Texas Health and Human Services Commission | Sherri Conner | Business Case, Framework Other - Web | Minor | 4/9/2007 | Minor | Low | Reject | | 4/9/2007 | Reject | | NA |